

ORIGINAL

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM

E-01575A-15-0127

From:  
Sent:  
To:  
Subject:

Richard Davis <sobaco@sanfili.com>  
Monday, September 28, 2015 11:49 AM  
BitterSmith-Web  
SVEC Proposed Action



I find SSVEC's intended rate increase and surcharge to solar users certainly the breaking of an implied contract. I wish I had retained all of the positive publicity SSVEC circulated to encourage investment in solar. Also, their "grandfathering" proposal is a feeble attempt at amelioration and the eradication of an important resale valuation consideration in our decision to invest in solar. I believe entities given monopolistic power should use their authority with equity and judiciousness.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 2 2015

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL  
2015 OCT 2 PM 4 38

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Ron Wilson <ronald.w.wilson@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 28, 2015 10:34 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC Proposed Rate Increase

Dear Commissioners,

Vote NO on SSVEC's recent proposed rate increase! It is blatantly unfair in that it singles out solar customers who are trying to save our environment. Twice the rate increase of non-solar customers is just wrong. I believe we need to pay for the grid but we should pay at the same rate as the non solar members of the co-op.

Thanks,

Ron Wilson | mobile: (520) 227-9696

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** libravo@q.com  
**Sent:** Friday, September 25, 2015 10:40 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web  
**Subject:** Sulphur Springs Valley Electric re: solar

Dear Commissioner Smith

I am a solar power (or Replace with non-solar power) member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, which is the utility involved in this case. I am against the approval of this case since SSVEC stated that there is a cost-shift, with solar customers not paying their fair share of grid costs. A cost shift is not unfair by default-SSVEC's rates already include a number of cost-shifts due to rate design, where customers pay less or more than their fair share of grid costs. Some examples are customers who leave town for much of the year, customers with very low or very high-energy use, and urban versus rural customers. Cost-shifts should be considered in a rate case at the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC). This process would allow a careful weighing of the best policy options for SSVEC's ratepayers, along with introduction of evidence, expert testimony, and significant ratepayer input. This would be a win - win for everyone.

In addition, I request that the ACC make it clear to SSVEC that notices to the public that contain unilateral cut-off dates (in this case 14 April 2015) are completely unacceptable and must be discontinued now and into the future. Historically, the AAC does not grant back dated decisions to utilities and hopefully the ACC will continue that tradition in this case. The effect of SSVEC including a cut-off date of close-of-business 14 April 2015 for installed PV systems or a signed "request for interconnection and reservation agreement" was to immediately curtail the installation of new solar power systems paid for or leased by individual members; even though, in all likelihood, the ACC would not back date its decision which would be made months into the future. SSVEC members were misled into thinking they could no longer install individual solar power systems, which was not true.

Sincerely,  
David Cook  
2461 Candlewood Dr  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Tim & Roz Mahon <trsierravista@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:08 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; Burns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web  
**Cc:** Tom Kennedy  
**Subject:** Recent SSVEC Rate Proposal, Docket #: E-01575A-15-0312

In December 2011, we contracted with Net Zero Solar LLC, to install a rooftop solar system. To date we have been very satisfied with the installation and performance of the system.

We purchased our solar system due to both SSVEC, state and federal government encouragement and incentives. However, we were still required to spend a considerable amount of our savings to pay for the system.

We accepted this with the understanding that over a seven to ten year period with the rate plan given to us by SSVEC we would reach a break-even point on our investment and increase the value of our home.

We were both stunned and offended in the way SSVEC has proposed and explained the need for a rate increase. They have broken their promises to us and portrayed the pioneers of the rooftop solar systems as the problem.

We urge you, please reject this recent SSVEC rate increase proposal.

Sincerely,

Tim and Rosalind Mahon  
Sierra Vista, AZ  
(520) 803-9320

## **Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Jay Garwood <jay.garwood@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2015 10:04 AM  
**To:** tedoyle@cox.net  
**Cc:** BitterSmith-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** Individual Petition Opposing the SSVEC Base Rate Increase  
**Attachments:** HGarwood Petition Individual\_Rescind SSVEC Sep 15 Base Rate Increase Request\_17Sep15 (2).docx

Attached is my individual petition opposing the SSVEC Base Rate Increase your commission currently has before it.

**Public Comment:**

I fully understand the cost of business is increasing in all industries and SSVEC's desire to provide fair quality service to their members. Given the current economic downturn in Arizona and more specifically southern Arizona where the majority of SSVEC's business is, I cannot support their request at this time. Tell SSVEC to come back when the economy has turned the corner and is beginning to recover.

Sincerely,

HW [Jay] Garwood  
Cell: [520] 678-0295

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Frederick Johnson Sr <fmjsr60@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2015 9:37 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web  
**Subject:** Rate increase docket number E-01575A-15-0312

ACC Chairman BitterSmith,

This letter is in reference to docket number E-01575A-15-0312. I am an SSVEC customer and I want to make it known that I am absolutely opposed to the rate increases that SSVEC is proposing. I am also a rooftop solar owner so I'm even more concerned that they are proposing such a large increase to those of us who put in a significant investment into what was being promoted by the company at the time.

The information I've been reading says SSVEC is losing money because those of us with rooftop solar are not contributing to the support of existing infrastructure. I don't see how such a small group of about 1300 solar customers could have such a large impact on the more than 53000 SSVEC customer base. None of us have a zero dollar electric bill every month so it is not like we are not paying into the program.

I am not opposed to a reasonable rate increase. The cost of doing business always goes up and the company has to maintain itself. But what SSVEC is asking for is more than outrageous. It is a common negotiating strategy to ask for an outrageous thing and negotiate down to something close to what you really wanted all along. To raise rate in general from \$10.25 to \$25 is pretty steep. To single out one small group of consumers and have the base rate move from \$10.25 to \$50 a month, even if it is over a 4 year period is also a ridiculous request. I highly doubt a rate increase request of 100% each year for 4 years in a row would be given serious consideration. One of the reasons the corporation commission exists is to ensure that utility companies, which are a monopoly, treats its customers fairly. I don't see any way that what SSVE has asked for is fair to any of its customers. I trust that the commission will act accordingly and protect our local consumers.

Respectfully,

Frederick and Catherine Johnson  
Sierra Vista AZ

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Roger Harder <rogerharder@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2015 3:05 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC Rate Increase Comment (Docket #: E-01575A-15-0312) - Please Reject Rate Increase

Dear Commissioners,

As a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) since 2003 and a prospective solar user, I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312).

I have been researching the viability of installing a solar rooftop system in my own home and what I have found in every credible study says solar **does have benefits to the grid**. Drastic changes specific to solar customers are very premature, especially since the ACC hasn't completed the Value & Cost of Distributed Generation (Including Net Metering) docket.

Based upon the limited information provided by SSVEC, this rate increase request involving the phased introduction of base rates (\$50 monthly for distributed generation [DG]members; \$25 monthly for all other members) at a very minimum adversely impacts members that do not use a lot of electricity.

Examples of such SSVEC members are those that have energy efficient homes, those that live in this home only part of the year (e.g., snowbirds), and those that do not use electricity as their main power source, or that generate their own electricity (DG – wind and solar). In addition, SSVEC should be bound by the written and implied contracts it has with its current DG members (no base rate was mentioned-why not grandfather) and the ACC should consider whether this sends the signal the commission wants to those using or planning to use less electricity.

Additionally, I would think the ACC must be concerned about the negative impacts this egregious SSVEC rate increase would have on jobs in Arizona. Since any new individual home solar rooftop systems would not appear to make financial sense now, local Arizona jobs would be lost, and utility scale solar project(s), such as SSVEC is planning, would not make up for these job losses. I am not going to suggest a solution to SSVEC's rate issues, as I only have the limited information provided by SSVEC; but I will suggest that SSVEC relook the rates for all of its customers based upon the information in this email and others like it.

Why single out solar? Other specific customer subclasses also impose costs. Rural customers cost more than urban customers, people who build efficient "energy star" rated homes that don't use a lot of power, and snowbirds might not be paying their "fair share" either if this egregious attack on solar "net zero" customers is valid.

SSVEC's planned changes are regressive. They impose increased costs on customers with low electric usage (older people and low income families), and de-incentivize conservation and energy efficiency.

So, it seems to me that folks who use less energy by installing solar or energy star systems are saving SSVEC a lot of money by making the personal capital investments that SSVEC avoids in energy purchases and additional infrastructure to support higher energy use.

And I understand there must be a minimum monthly charge on every customer's bill to support metering, grid maintenance, and billing, however, it appears to me that the current monthly \$10.25 plus fees should be adequate to cover those costs and maintenance of the grid. It does not need to be increased 150% for non-solar customers and 400% for solar users.

Finally, it would appear to me that SSVEC's net operating margins in 2014 (from their annual report) increased 1.7% to \$6,392,061. Curious that they say solar customers are costing them money but they actually increased profits in 2014.

SSVEC must work for a win-win solution that preserves energy choice and fairness for all of their customers.

Upon consideration of the preceding information and as a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312).

Sincerely,

Roger K Harder  
Sierra Vista

## **Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Russ Williams <russ@rawilliams.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2015 9:32 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web  
**Subject:** Proposed DG/Net Metering Rate Changes Docket E-01575A-15-0312

Dear Commissioners,

Re: Docket E-01575A-15-0312

I am concerned and appalled by the current effort to "fast track" a rate increase for DG, net metered customers.

The influence of "Dark Money" over the ACC members from APS, ALEC, and others have tainted the appearance of fairness.

I have issues with my local power company, SSVEC regarding the actual cost vs value of solar and other services SSVEC provides to their customers. The Net metered members are being singled out as being unfair without any supporting cost information and SSVEC is unwilling to share their information.

In the a notice we received in April , SSVEC referred to "their study" that was used to generate a \$71.89 cost for all customers.

- 1) Monthly Cost to connect to a home (\$23.02)
- 2) monthly cost to connect to a transformer (\$21.35)
- 3) monthly cost to connect to the power plant (\$27.52)
- 4) Total of all 3 (\$71.89)

When I requested a copy of the study, SSVEC referred me to meaningless data inside hundreds of pages of poorly scanned, accounting spreadsheets within an old ACC docket that had been combined, with another docket. When I asked Mr. Bane of SSVEC to identify where within the dockets I can find the information, he again referred me to the hundreds of pages of spreadsheets. I also received a CC email from Mr. Jack Blair instructing Mr. Bane:

"And after you refer him back to document no further response. We will still be corresponding with him months from now. He can always come to our board meeting and ask the board" From email received from Jack Blair 4-17-15 at 9:18am

When I asked SSVEC CEO Mr. Huber about the "study" at the April board meeting, he said "the study does not exist".

My concern is that these rate increases are being "fast tracked" without proper review of the actual costs to all SSVEC customers.

In the current notice, net metered customers are again being singled out as "unfair" without any supporting cost or value data. The proposed rate change will cost all DG net metered customers \$50 per month vs the current \$10.25 and all other residential customers \$25 ve the current \$10.20.

There is no reason for service to my home to cost SSVEC any more than any other home beyond the additional \$2.70 "net metered" fee that I am currently paying.

These increases are huge for all SSVEC customers and unfair to net metered customers who along with the taxpayers, invested a lot of money installing these systems.

In my case, the final monthly bill would be the same or more than before I installed my PV system.

How is this fair or reasonable?

SSVEC is saying that they will have lost assets. What about our asset costs and the expenses to maintain our systems?

Can we as DG/net metered customers and suppliers impose a monthly charge for SSVEC to connect to our systems?

Would we be permitted to store electricity on our property?

Would we be permitted or possibly required to install a battery backup system to alleviate spikes in demand?

This DG rate issue is shared with all net metered customers in Arizona not just SSVEC.

It is unfair to impose these rate changes without a fair and open review of all costs and value related to DG and other services these power companies supply.

I am strongly opposed to any DG rate changes at this time.

Russ Williams

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** David Loeffelman <dcloeffelman@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2015 8:05 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC Rate Proposal

Dear Commissioners,

I am deeply troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. I am a solar user and I feel that this is discrimination at its worst because non solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month.

I could go into great detail on why this is unfair but the one overriding fact which trumps all the rest, and that is that they are reneging on a contract with people who installed solar in good faith in past years. Based on what SSVEC is proposing will essentially destroy residential solar in Cochise county. Finally, It would appear to me that SSVEC's net operating margins in 2014 (from their annual report) increased 1.7% to \$6,392,061. Curious that they say solar customers are costing them money but they actually increased profits in 2014.

Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal.

Respectfully Submitted:

David A. Loeffelman  
Terra Vista, AZ 85650

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Janet Rech <kcwrex@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 20, 2015 8:48 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC's Recent Rate Proposal

Dear Commissioners,

**In the SSVEC Community there are approximately 1,300 rooftop installations out of approximately 53,000 SSVEC customers. We do not believe that such a small number of installations can account for the massive increases SSVEC is proposing. SSVEC's recent rate proposal will increase rooftop solar users base rate from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. As a solar user we feel this is discrimination at its worst because non solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month. In addition, when we installed rooftop solar SSVEC agreed to pay \$.125/ KWH for excess power produced from solar. However, in their current rate proposal they want to pay us \$.0258, a substantial decrease from the current rate.**

**There are numerous reasons why this is unfair, but there is one overriding fact which trumps all the rest. This fact is SSVEC is reneging on a contract with people who installed solar in good faith in past years.**

**If there was another company we could switch to for power, we would do it, but we are a captive audience and are at the mercy of any ACC ruling on the SSVEC rate increase.**

**Bottom line is we feel betrayed by SSVEC.**

**Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal.**

**Roger and Janet Rech**

**2978 Glenview Dr.  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650  
520-335-2126**

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Cecil Britton <cbritman@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 20, 2015 1:40 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC Rate Increase Comment (Docket #: E-01575A-15-0312) -

Dear Commissioners,

As a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312). Based upon the limited information provided by SSVEC, this rate increase request involving the phased introduction of base rates (\$50 monthly for distributed generation [DG] members; \$25 monthly for all other members) at a very minimum adversely impacts members that do not use a lot of electricity. Examples of such SSVEC members are those that have energy efficient homes, that live in this home part of the year (e.g., snowbirds), that do not use electricity as their main power source, or that generate their own electricity (DG - wind and solar). In addition, SSVEC should be bound by the written and implied contracts it has with its current DG members (no base rate was mentioned; why not grandfather) and the ACC should consider whether this sends the signal the commission wants to those using or planning to use less electricity. Finally, I would think the ACC would be concerned about the negative impacts the SSVEC rate increase would have on jobs in Arizona. Since any new individual home solar rooftop applications would not appear to make financial sense, local Arizona jobs would be lost, and utility scale solar project(s), such as SSVEC is planning, would not make up for these job losses. I am not going to suggest a solution to SSVEC's rate issues, as I only have the limited information provided by SSVEC; but I will suggest that SSVEC relook the rates for all of its customers based upon the information in this email and others like it.

In this paragraph I would like to provide one example of how DG members are saving SSVEC infrastructure costs, so why the big base rate difference to non-DG members? If the 1,300 solar members spent at least \$20,000 to install their systems, this results in a minimum \$26 million infrastructure savings for SSVEC. I would also like to provide an example of the actual base rate

impact on a SSVEC non-DG member. It shows the largest percentage increase will be to those members in smaller homes and trailers who can least afford the increase. In other words, the poorest will have the largest percentage increase. Here is the analysis of a recent 12-month period for an 1865 square foot, 10-year-old home with air conditioning that used about 3600 kilowatts or an average of 300 per month:

Current monthly amount: \$48.05 (plus percentage of bill taxes and fees).  $(300 \times .126 = \$37.80 \text{ [energy use]} + \$10.25 \text{ [facility charge]} = \$48.05)$

Proposed monthly amount: \$55.55 (plus percentage of bill taxes and fees).  $(300 \times .102 = \$30.60 \text{ [energy use]} + \$25.00 \text{ [facility charge]} = \$55.55)$

Percent increase: 15.6% - much more than the 3.17% in SSVEC's notice.  $(\$55.55 \text{ minus } \$48.05 = \$7.50, \text{ then } \$7.50 \text{ divided by } \$48.05 = 15.6\%)$

Upon consideration of the proceeding information and as a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312).

I would add or reiterate that if the claimed negative impact on rates that SSVEC is claiming is factual then that same negative impact existed when they contracted with me to install about \$26,000 worth of solar in my home. This whole thing may be the result of gross incompetence on the part of SSVEC management; if not then it is a patent case of bait and switch that they are trying to perpetrate on their Co-Op members. Is this the kind of reputation a major non-profit corporation wants to entertain and do our elected state officials want to abet such actions?

Sincerely,

Cecil Britton  
Sierra Vista, AZ

## **Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Nancy Ament <dnament@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 19, 2015 2:00 PM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Cc:** 'Tom Kennedy'  
**Subject:** SSVEC REQUEST FOR RATE INCREASES

As a member of the Sulfur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC), I strongly urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the SSVEC rate increase request (Docket No. E-01575A-15-0312.) This proposal would unfairly penalize those of us who have installed roof top solar: i.e. Base rate would go from \$10.25 per month to \$50 for us as well as a jump to \$25 for non-solar customers.

In your deliberations, please remember that SSVEC actively solicited participation in the solar program as evidenced by their literature at the time and their 59% rebate program. Even so, the capital outlay for a homeowner was substantial and helped the cooperative move toward their renewable energy goals. Now, however, we homeowners are being demonized as being unfair to non-solar customers. It seems to me that SSVEC was directly complicit in promoting roof top solar and perhaps to paraphrase Jimmy Buffett, "It's their own damn fault!"

In short, this request is, and the earlier SSVEC request in April 2015 was, clearly prejudicial to their solar customers and has already sent a chilling message to the small business solar installers in Arizona which will mean loss of jobs. Perhaps SSVEC is trying to corner the solar market with their announced plan to build a large solar farm.

Again, I urge the commission to reject this rate increase request and perhaps suggest to SSVEC that they submit a more fair and balanced proposal if they so choose. Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Ament  
2647 Meadowbrook Place  
Sierra Vista AZ 85650  
Telephone: 520-803-6551

## Teresa Tenbrink

---

From: Dale Janet Murphy <drjdm88@cox.net>  
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2015 8:04 AM  
To: BitterSmith-Web  
Subject: Fwd: SSVEC Member Reply to Proposed Base Rate Increase - For ACC; Use as You Wish

Dear Commissioner Bitter-Smith,

As a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312). Based upon the limited information provided by SSVEC, this rate increase request involving the phased introduction of base rates (\$50 monthly for distributed generation [DG] members; \$25 monthly for all other members) at a very minimum adversely impacts members that do not use a lot of electricity. Examples of such SSVEC members are those that have energy efficient homes, that live in this home part of the year (e.g., snowbirds), that do not use electricity as their main power source, or that generate their own electricity (DG - wind and solar). In addition, SSVEC should be bound by the written and implied contracts it has with its current DG members (no base rate was mentioned; why not grandfather) and the ACC should consider whether this sends the signal the commission wants to those using or planning to use less electricity. Finally, I would think the ACC would be concerned about the negative impacts the SSVEC rate increase would have on jobs in Arizona. Since any new individual home solar rooftop applications would not appear to make financial sense, local Arizona jobs would be lost, and utility scale solar project(s), such as SSVEC is planning, would not make up for these job losses. I am not going to suggest a solution to SSVEC's rate issues, as I only have the limited information provided by SSVEC; but I will suggest that SSVEC relook the rates for all of its customers based upon the information in this email and others like it.

In this paragraph I would like to provide one example of how DG members are saving SSVEC infrastructure costs, so why the big base rate difference to non-DG members? If the 1,300 solar members spent at least \$20,000 to install their systems, this results in a minimum \$26 million infrastructure savings for SSVEC. I would also like to provide an example of the actual base rate impact on a SSVEC non-DG member. It shows the largest percentage increase will be to those members in smaller homes and trailers who can least afford the increase. In other words, the poorest will have the largest percentage increase. Here is the analysis of a recent 12-month period for an 1865 square foot, 10-year-old home with air conditioning that used about 3600 kilowatts or an average of 300 per month:

Current monthly amount: \$48.05 (plus percentage of bill taxes and fees).  $(300 \times .126 = \$37.80 \text{ [energy use]} + \$10.25 \text{ [facility charge]} = \$48.05)$

Proposed monthly amount: \$55.55 (plus percentage of bill taxes and fees).  $(300 \times .102 = \$30.60 \text{ [energy use]} + \$25.00 \text{ [facility charge]} = \$55.55)$

Percent increase: 15.6% - much more than the 3.17% in SSVEC's notice.  $(\$55.55 \text{ minus } \$48.05 = \$7.50, \text{ then } \$7.50 \text{ divided by } \$48.05 = 15.6\%)$

Upon consideration of the proceeding information and as a member of the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) I urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject the latest SSVEC rate increase request (Docket number: E-01575A-15-0312).

Sincerely,  
Dale Murphy  
Sierra Vista



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** bgestes72 <bgestes72@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 18, 2015 11:57 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web  
**Subject:** Docket # E-01575A-15-0312

Susan Bitter Smith(ACC)  
[bittersmith-web@azcc.gov](mailto:bittersmith-web@azcc.gov)

Dear Commissioner,

I would hope that one of the roles of the ACC is to consider and protect citizens against arbitrary and unfair rates and policies of Arizona utilities. In this regard, I am troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period, whereas non solar rates only go to a proposed \$25.00 per month.

After being encouraged by federal and local (SSVEC) initiatives to install an expensive solar system on my home, I am now a solar user, the system which was contractually arranged with SSVEC. This organization now wants to radically and unilaterally change the agreement. I feel that this move by SSVEC is violation of our agreement and is discriminatory and unfair at its worst. **Please reject this SSVEC** proposal. A reasonable increase that does not unfairly treat or make solar users look like the bad guys in the SSVEC community should be the goal of The Commission and SSVEC. Please help.

Bill J. Fears  
749 Glenview Dr.  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650  
[bgestes72@yahoo.com](mailto:bgestes72@yahoo.com)

**Teresa Tenbrink**

---

**From:** Michelle Constancia <doxiedog1@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 18, 2015 8:24 AM  
**To:** BitterSmith-Web  
**Subject:** SSVEC PROPOSED RATE INCREASE

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

September 17, 2015

Docket number E-01575A-15-0312

Dear Commissioners,

There is a rate proposal on the table by SSVEC to increase the base rate, which deeply troubles me, in which my base rate would increase from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over 4 years.

I invested a substantial amount of money based on verbal, printed and generally released information by SSVEC and their promises for the good of our environment and future generations in my home; based on this agreement/promise/contract of good faith from SSVEC I invested a tidy sum.

The proposed financial increases for solar installations owners and those without solar are not based on anything rational, fair or in line with, again, promises made. What has happened to honor and integrity and your word? And, as a solar user I believe this is discrimination at its worst as non-solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month.

One fact trumps all. SSVEC is reneging on a contract with people who installed solar based on their original information and contract, which we made in good faith.

The right action, the honorable action, the legal action based on original information and materials distributed is to reject this SSVEC proposal.

Sincerely,

Michelle Constancia  
2804 Glenview Drive  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650  
520.803.7231

## **Individual Petition Opposing the SSVEC Base Rate Increase**

As an SSVEC member I DO NOT support the SSVEC Board's request to raise the Base Rates for our electric cooperative and therefore petition the SSVEC Board to rescind their petition to the Arizona Corporation Commission.

Type Name(s) here: Harold W. Garwood